PLUTARCH'S "ALEXANDER" AND ARRIAN'S "ANABASIS"

By R. B. Steele

The information presented in the *Alexander* and in the *Anabasis* was gathered from previous writers, and it is not possible either from the facts themselves or from the form of statement to determine to what extent Arrian may have been influenced by Plutarch. Individual items are for the most part much more briefly stated in the *Alexander*, and for this reason parallelism in form is often impossible. Let a few illustrations suffice. The fact stated in Plut. 16, 1. 42: Ὁμοῦ δὲ καὶ 'Ροισάκης ἔπεσεν ὑπὸ 'Αλεξάνδρου ξίφει πληγείς, is given in five lines by Arr. in 1. 15. 7–8; and Plut. 71. 31: ἀπέλυσε τοὺς ἀχρήστους δωρησάμενος μεγαλοπρεπῶς, gives in the words ἀχρήστους and δωρησάμενος two items which Arr. in 7. 12. 1–2 expands to seven lines. Even where the statements of the two are of fairly equal length, we cannot tell (*a*) what were the exact words of the original, or (*b*) what was the arrangement of the words. A few of the many examples will be enough to illustrate both phases: (*a*) Plut. 11. 45: τοὺς ἀπὸ Πινδάρου γεγονότας: Arr. 1. 9. 10: τοὺς ἀπογόνους τοῦ Πινδάρου; Plut. 13. 2: καὶ γὰρ τὴν τῶν μυστερίων ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες: Arr. 1. 10. 2: μ. τῶν μεγάλων ἀγομένων; Plut. 14. 12: ἠρώτησεν, εἴ τινος τυγχάνει δεόμενος: Arr. 7. 2. 1: ἐρόμενος εἴ του δέοιτο; Plut. 45. 20: λίθῳ πληγείς: Arr. 4. 3. 3: βάλλεται λίθῳ; Plut. 67. 2: διὰ τῆς Καρμανίας: Arr. 6. 28. 1: διὰ Κ.; Plut. 68. 2: περὶ τὸν πλοῦν: Arr. 6. 28. 5: ἀμφὶ τὸν περίπλουν; Plut. 71. 30: ἐδάκρυε πολὺν χρόνον: Arr. 7. 11. 5: αὐτῷ προχεῖται δάκρυα. (*b*) Occasionally the order of words is not the same in the two writers, and it cannot be determined which has preserved the original arrangement. We give as illustrations of this Plut. 18. 13: ἐξελόντι τοῦ ῥυμοῦ τὸν ἔστορα καλούμενον: Arr. 2. 3. 7: ἐξελόντα τὸν ἔστορα τοῦ ῥυμοῦ, and 'Αριστόβουλος λέγει introduces both; Plut. 20. 28: τρωθῆναι ξίφει τὸν μηρόν: Arr. 2. 12. 1: τετρωμένος τὸν μηρὸν ξίφει; and with change in construction as well as in arrangement Plut. 19. 24: τοῦ μὲν ἀναγινώσκοντος, τοῦ δὲ πίνοντος: Arr. 2. 4. 10: καὶ ὁμοῦ τόν τε 'Αλέξανδρον πίνειν καὶ τὸν Φίλιππον ἀναγινώσκειν τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Παρμενίωνος; Plut. 29. 1: εἰς δὲ

Φοινίκην ἐπανελθὼν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου: Arr. 3. 6. 1: ἐκ Μέμφιος ᾖει ἐπὶ Φοινίκης. As an instance of change in words and also in order we give Plut. 44. 13: Ὁ δὲ ἤνεγκεν οὐ μετρίως, ἀλλὰ κήρυκα πέμψας ἠπεί-λησε πάντας ἀποκτενεῖν μετὰ τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν, εἰ τὸν ἵππον αὐτῷ μὴ ἀναπέμψειαν, and Arr. 5. 19. 6: προεκήρυξεν ἀνὰ τὴν χώραν πάντας ἀποκτενεῖν Οὐξίους εἰ μὴ ἀπάξουσιν αὐτῷ τὸν ἵππον.

It is not impossible, though it cannot be proved, that some of the statements of Arrian were intended to define more clearly the words of Plutarch, or even to correct what he had written. This is possible in the last clause of the account of the acts of Alexander at Ilium as given by Plut. 15. 22: Τὴν δὲ Ἀχιλλέως στήλην ἀλειψά-μενος λίπα καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἑταίρων συναναδραμὼν γυμνός, ὥσπερ ἔθος ἐστίν, ἐστεφάνωσε μακαρίσας αὐτόν, ὅτι καὶ ζῶν φίλου πιστοῦ καὶ τελευ-τήσας μεγάλου κήρυκος ἔτυχεν; and Arr. 1. 12. 1: Ἡφαιστίωνα δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι τοῦ Πατρόκλου τὸν τάφον ἐστεφάνωσε· καὶ εὐδαιμόνισεν ἄρα, ὡς λόγος, Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀχιλλέα, ὅτι Ὁμήρου κήρυκος ἐς τὴν ἔπειτα μνήμην ἔτυχε.

Plutarch writes in 21. 7 in regard to the captive women: Πέμπει Λεοννάτον, ἀπαγγεῖλαι κελεύσας, ὡς οὔτε Δαρεῖος τέθνηκεν οὔτε Ἀλέξαν-δρον δεδιέναι χρή· Δαρείῳ γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἡγεμονίας πολεμεῖν, ἐκείναις δὲ πάντα ὑπάρξειν, ὧν καὶ Δαρείου βασιλεύοντος ἠξιοῦντο, while Arrian has in 2. 12. 5: πέμψαι πρὸς αὐτὰς Λεοννάτον ἐντειλάμενον φράσαι ὅτι ζῇ Δαρεῖος, and in five lines gives the statement of Leonnatus in regard to τὴν θεραπείαν, and ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς Ἀσίας διαπεπολεμῆσθαι. What seems to be an out-and-out correction is found in Arr. 5. 20. 4: Καὶ ἔλαβε πόλεις μὲν ἐς τριάκοντα καὶ ἑπτά, ὧν ἵνα ὀλίγιστοι ἦσαν οἰκήτορες πεντακισχιλίων οὐκ ἐλάττους ἦσαν, πολλῶν δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ τοὺς μυρίους· καὶ κώμας πλήθει τε πολλὰς ἔλαβε καὶ πολυανθρώπους οὐ μεῖον τῶν πόλεων. καὶ ταύτης τῆς χώρας Πώρῳ ἄρχειν ἔδωκεν. Plutarch has in 60. 57: Ἀλλὰ καὶ προσέθηκε χώραν καὶ τοὺς αὐτονόμους κατα-στρεψάμενος, ἐν ᾗ πεντεκαίδεκα μὲν ἔθνη, πόλεις δὲ πεντακισχιλίας ἀξιο-λόγους, κώμας δὲ παμπόλλας εἶναί φασιν· ἄλλην δὲ τρὶς τοσαύτην ἧς Φίλιππόν τινα τῶν ἑταίρων σατράπην ἀπέδειξεν.

The latter part of this gives the substance of what Arrian in 6. 15. 1–2 states in fifteen lines. However, all of these references individually or collectively merely indicate that Arrian *may* have used the *Alexander* at certain points as a guide in his own work.

If there are any more definite indications they are to be found chiefly in those portions in which one or the other or both have made some reference to the source followed, and in this respect there is a noticeable difference at many points.

Arrian frankly tells us that most of his material is drawn from Aristobulus and Ptolemy, and for this reason they are mentioned individually only for isolated items, and together only when they disagree or agree in the statement of some peculiar fact. A few other writers are mentioned, and there are also many indefinite references. There are many of the latter in the *Alexander*, where more writers are named than in the *Anabasis*. From this we might expect that references to authorities would be about the same. Yet as a matter of fact in many instances the references given by Arrian seem to have been called forth by the account of Plutarch.

Plutarch writes in 16. 56: τῶν δὲ περὶ τὸν 'Αλέξανδρον 'Αριστό-βουλός φησι τέσσαρας καὶ τριάκοντα νεκροὺς γενέσθαι τοὺς πάντας, ὧν ἐννέα πεζοὺς εἶναι. Τούτων μὲν οὖν ἐκέλευσεν εἰκόνας ἀνασταθῆναι χαλκᾶς, ἃς Λύσιππος εἰργάσατο. Arrian without reference to the source has in 1. 16. 4: Μακεδόνων δὲ τῶν μὲν ἑταίρων ἀμφὶ τοὺς εἴκοσι καὶ πέντε ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ προσβολῇ ἀπέθανον· καὶ τούτων χαλκαῖ εἰκόνες ἐν Δίῳ ἑστᾶσιν, 'Αλεξάνδρου κελεύσαντος Λύσιππον ποιῆσαι.

It is to be noticed that the change in the wording makes τούτων in Arrian refer to a different number. More frequently Arrian names Aristobulus as his authority where Plutarch gives no indica-tion of his source. Plut. 19. 3: ῏Ην δὲ ἡ διατριβὴ διὰ νόσον, ἣν οἱ μὲν ἐκ κόπων, οἱ δὲ λουσαμένῳ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Κύδνου ῥεύματι καταπαγέντι προσ-πεσεῖν λέγουσι: Arr. 2. 4. 7: 'Αλέξανδρος δὲ, ὡς μὲν 'Αριστοβούλῳ λέλεκται, ὑπὸ καμάτου ἐνόσησεν, οἱ δὲ ἐς τὸν Κύδνον ποταμὸν λέγουσι ῥίψαντα νήξασθαι. Similar to this is the account in Plut. 31. 19: ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοὶ γράφουσιν and in Arr. 6. 11. 5, where Ptolemy and Aristobulus are cited in regard to the fight at Gaugamela. We find in Plut. 45. 24: 'Αλλὰ καὶ τὸν 'Ορεξάρτην διαβὰς ποταμόν, ὃν αὐτὸς ᾤετο Τάναϊν εἶναι; in Arr. 3. 30. 6: Τῷ δὲ Ταναΐδι τούτῳ, ὃν δὴ καὶ 'Ορξάντην ἄλλῳ ὀνόματι πρὸς τῶν ἐπιχωρίων βαρβάρων καλεῖσθαι λέγει 'Αριστόβουλος. Plutarch in 70. 10 names Stateira as the wife of Alexander, Arrian in 7. 4. 4, Barsine, on the authority of Aristobulus. Plutarch in 73. 8–12 barely mentions the story about Pythagoras the

seer, but this in all its details takes up 38 lines in Arr. 7. 18, and we are told in sec. 5 that Aristobulus got it from Pythagoras himself. And the words in Plut., τὸ ἧπαρ ἦν ἄλοβον, and Arr. secs. 3 and 4, ἄλοβον τὸ ἧπαρ τοῦ ἱερείου, show that both were quoting from Aristobulus.

Noticeable are the words in Plut. 23. 1: Ἦν δὲ καὶ πρὸς οἶνον ἧττον ἢ ἐδόκει καταφερής. Ἔδοξε δὲ διὰ τὸν χρόνον, ὃν οὐ πίνων μᾶλλον ἢ λαλῶν εἷλκεν ἐφ᾽ ἑκάστης κύλικος, ἀεὶ μακρόν τινα λόγον διατιθέμενος, καὶ ταῦτα πολλῆς σχολῆς οὔσης. In the same chapter, line 33, we find αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν καὶ ὄψων ἐγκρατὴς ἦν, and in the superlative, 22. 24, ἦν δὲ καὶ γαστρὸς ἐγκρατέστατος. Arrian uses the same form in 7. 28. 2: ἡδονῶν δὲ τῶν μὲν τοῦ σώματος ἐ; and that the suggestion for them all came from Aristobulus can be seen from Arr. 7. 29. 4: καὶ οἱ πότοι δέ, ὡς λέγει Ἀριστόβουλος, οὐ τοῦ οἴνου ἕνεκα μακροὶ αὐτῷ ἐγίγνοντο, οὐ γὰρ πίνειν πολὺν οἶνον Ἀλέξανδρον, ἀλλὰ φιλοφροσύνης τῆς ἐς τοὺς ἑταίρους.

Speaking of the weapon with which Clitus was killed, Plutarch says in 51. 34: Οὕτω δὴ λαβὼν παρά τινος τῶν δορυφόρων Ἀλέξανδρος αἰχμήν, while Arrian has in 4. 8. 8: Γὰρ οἱ μὲν λόγχην ἁρπάσαι λέγουσι τῶν σωματοφυλάκων τινὸς καὶ ταύτῃ παίσαντα Κλεῖτον ἀποκτεῖναι, οἱ δὲ σάρισσαν παρὰ τῶν φυλάκων τινὸς καὶ ταύτην, and follows with the account of Aristobulus, closing with the words, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πληγέντα τῇ σαρίσσῃ ἀποθανεῖν. Similar in form to this statement of Arrian is Plut. 55. 29: οἱ μέν . . . . οἱ δέ . . . . Χάρης, while Arrian in 4. 14. 3 quotes from Aristobulus and Ptolemy for the first two items given by Plutarch. But most noticeable of all is Plut. 46 where are given the names of nine writers who do not have, and of five who have, the story of the Queen of the Amazons. Arrian in 7. 13. 4 rejects the story because it is given neither by Aristobulus nor Ptolemy nor any other trustworthy author. Among the writers mentioned by Plutarch as having the story is Onesicritus, and the attitude of Arrian toward him at this point is the same as in 6. 2. 3: καὶ τοῦτο ἐψεύσατο. And yet according to Plut. 61. 4, from him came the statement in regard to Bucephalus found in Arr. 5. 19. 5.

The characterization of the wife of Darius given in Plut. 21. 23 is introduced by λέγεται, and by ἐλέγετο in Arr. 4. 19. 6. Both Plutarch and Arrian give the statement by Aristobulus in regard

to the Gordian knot, and in both it follows similar statements: Plut. 18. 7: οἱ μὲν οὖν πολλοί φασι . . . . , διατεμεῖν τῇ μαχαίρᾳ τὸ σύναμμα: Arr. 2. 3. 7: οἱ μὲν λέγουσιν ὅτι παίσας τῷ ξίφει διέκοψε τὸν δεσμόν.

What Plutarch in 54. 15 ascribes to Chares, Arrian in 4. 12. 3 introduces by ἀναγέγραπται . . . . λόγος. Not altogether unlike this is the authority for the story of the eunuch who fled to Darius. Arrian has in 4. 20. 1, λόγος κατέχει, though Plutarch closes chap. 30 with the words: ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω γενέσθαι τε καὶ λεχθῆναί φασιν οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν συγγραφέων. We find in Plut. 63. 6, in regard to the Malli, οὓς φασιν Ἰνδῶν μαχιμωτάτους γενέσθαι; and in Arr. 6. 4. 3: πλείστους τε καὶ μ. τῶν ταύτῃ Ἰνδῶν πυνθανόμενος.

The *Ephemerides* and the letters of Alexander must have for both writers the ultimate authority if direct use was made of them. Plutarch quotes from the latter in 60, mentioning them both at the beginning and at the end of his account of the battle with Porus. But into this he introduces a statement from Onesicritus, and says nothing of the part taken by the son of Porus, in regard to whom Arrian in 5. 14 quotes from both Aristobulus and Ptolemy. But the most noticeable passages are Plut. 76 and Arr. 7. 25, in which both quote from the *Ephemerides* in regard to the sickness and death of Alexander. As in the account of the battle with Porus, Plutarch twice affirms the source of his statements, 77. 1: τούτων τὰ πλεῖστα κατὰ λέξιν ἐν ταῖς ἐφημερίσιν οὕτω γέγραπται. It is noticeable that Arrian has a triple affirmation in 7. 25. 1, 26. 1, 2, although verbally considered the two accounts are widely different. A few references will be enough to show this: Plut.: ἐκάθευδεν ἐν τῷ λουτρῶνι διὰ τὸ πυρέξαι: Arr.: καθεύδειν αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἤδη ἐπύρεσσεν; Plut.: διὰ νυκτὸς ἐπύρεξε: Arr.: πυρέσσειν . . . . τὴν νύκτα ὅλην; Plut.: παρὰ τὴν μεγάλην κολυμβήθραν: Arr.: πρὸς τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ. At one point at least Arrian adhers more closely to the *Ephemerides*, for in 7. 26. 2 he gives the names of seven men sent to the temple of Serapis, while Plutarch gives only the first and last. The comparison of the two accounts given by Fraenkel, *Die Quellen der Alexanderhistoriker*, pp. 41 ff., shows that Plutarch gives the days with reference to the last; Arrian with reference to the first, designating each successive day by τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ (which Plutarch does not use),

excepting for one day, where he has τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ for the words of Plutarch τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν ἡμέραν. Arrian ends chap. 25 with the words, καὶ τὴν νύκτα πυρέσσειν κακῶς καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην νύκτα καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν. He then continues in chap. 26 with the account of the visit of the soldiers to Alexander, and the delegation to Serapis, closing with the words: οὐ πολὺ ὕστερον ἀποθανεῖν, ὡς τοῦτο ἄρα ἤδη ὂν τὸ ἄμεινον.

While the *Ephemerides* were the ultimate source for the close of Alexander's life, at some point along the line of transmission there had been a conscious variation from their phraseology, and here we have the verbalization of Arrian or of Aristobulus and also that of Plutarch or of some earlier writer. In the use of τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ, and in the introduction of Arrian's opinions, chaps. 25–27 are of a piece with all the rest of the *Anabasis*, and it is certainly not impossible that Arrian deliberately varied from the account of Plutarch.

At nearly every point in the discussion an appeal may be made to some unknown source as an explanation of any resemblance. But Arrian in 4. 9. 8, writing of Anaxarchus, gives us what seems to be an original opinion: ταῦτα εἰπόντα παραμυθήσασθαι μὲν ᾿Αλέξανδρον ἐν τῷ τότε, κακὸν δὲ μέγα, ὡς ἐγώ φημι, ἐξεργάσασθαι ᾿Αλεξάνδρῳ καὶ μεῖζον ἔτι ἢ ὅτῳ τότε ξυνείχετο. And yet these words but re-express what seems to be an original opinion of Plutarch in 52. 23: Τοιούτοις τισὶ λόγοις χρησάμενος ὁ ᾿Ανάξαρχος τὸ μὲν πάθος ἐκούφισε τοῦ βασιλέως, τὸ δὲ ἦθος εἰς πολλὰ χαυνότερον καὶ παρανομώτερον ἐποίησεν, αὐτὸν δὲ δαιμονίως ἐνήρμοσε. In 56. 1 Plutarch says, ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὕστερον ἐπράχθη, following the different accounts of the death of Callisthenes. Arrian at the same point in the narrative has in 4. 14. 4: ταῦτα μὲν δὴ οὐ πολλῷ ὕστερον πραχθέντα ἐγὼ ἐν τοῖσδε τοῖς ἀμφὶ Κλεῖτον ξυνενεχθεῖσιν ᾿Αλεξάνδρῳ ἀνέγραψα. In both of these passages from Arrian there is an evident adaptation of the account of Plutarch. And the testimony here at least is strong enough to indicate that the account of Arrian cannot be considered as absolutely independent of that of Plutarch. The appeals to sources in the *Anabasis* in a number of instances find a ready explanation in the desire of Arrian to establish a show of originality by varying from Plutarch. At the same time the emended statements and quotations varying in words and arrangement indicate, though

no claim is put forth, a keener historical and rhetorical perception. If this fairly expresses the attitude of Arrian, we may assume that he adheres more closely than does Plutarch to the phraseology of his sources, and that his is a more deliberate judgment at certain points in regard to the facts presented.

However, in regard to phraseology there can be no absolute certainty. Arrian's rejection of the story of the Queen of the Amazons, based on the material already gathered by Plutarch, is a good illustration of his attitude toward some of the elements in the history of Alexander. It can be illustrated still further by his account of the fight of Alexander against the Malli, 6. 9–11. His words in 7. 5. 5 show that Peucestes and Leonnatus were two of the defenders. In 6. 10. 1 he names these and Abreas, though admitting in 6. 11. 7 that the only one mentioned by all writers is Peucestes, who is given by Diodorus in 17. 99. 4 with some others unnamed, by Plutarch in 63 with Λιμναῖος, and by Curtius in 9. 5. 14–15 with Timaeus, Leonnatus, and Aristonus. There has evidently been a series of variations in the name Λεοννάτος: Λιμναῖος: Timaeus. Curtius makes a good story better by adding Aristonus, perhaps a prelude for the later account of his importance. Arrian found 'Αβρέας in some of the writers, perhaps Ptolemy who was not at the battle, but he finds no justification for Λιμναῖος: Timaeus.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE